

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed November 7, 2008 has been carefully considered. Within the Office Action Claims 1-14 have been rejected. The Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 13 and have cancelled Claim 12. The Applicants reserve the right to further pursue the cancelled claim in a continuation and/or divisional application as well as for appeal purposes. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph Rejection

Claims 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was allegedly not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to practice the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed. However, to expedite prosecution, Claim 12 has been cancelled and Claim 13 has been amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed. However, to expedite prosecution of the present case, Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

First Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4 and 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0017305 to Roitman et al. (hereinafter "Roitman") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0020595 to

Khan et al. (hereinafter “Khan”), U.S. Patent No. 6,251,219 to Chen et al. (hereinafter “Chen”) or Japanese Patent Publication No. 2000-71422 to Watanabe et al. (hereinafter “Watanabe”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, it is stated in the office action that Roitman discloses the use of screen printing, and that it would have been obvious to combine Roitman with the screen printing techniques in the other cited references in reaching the claimed subject matter. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

In determining obviousness four factual inquiries must be looked into in regards to determining obviousness. These are determining the scope and content of the prior art; ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue; resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and evaluating evidence of secondary consideration. Graham v. John Deere, 383 U.S. 1 (1966); KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., No 04-1350 (U.S. Apr. 30, 2007) (“ Often, it will be necessary . . . to look into related teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an **apparent reason** to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue. To facilitate review, this analysis **should be made explicit.**”) (emphasis added).

Applicants’ specification states that in the case of transfer of a glue micro-drops array, the bond onto the transfer support (namely the grid) depends only on the surface area of the micro-drops that will only be deposited on the surfaces of the substrate in contact with the grid, so that very small cavities will not be covered. (Specification, Page 10, Line 27-Page 11, Line 2). The specification also states that an array of glue micro-droplets deposited by the grid is transferred onto the upper surfaces 26 of the substrate in which glue does not penetrate into the

cavities. In particular, the size of the micro-drops is similar to the size of the smallest cavities or recesses. (Specification, Page 11, Line 2).

Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to recite that an array of glue droplets are placed on the mask-less grid in which the glue droplets form a glue film on the substrate when the tool is pressed against the grid. Also, Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the size of each glue droplet is substantially equal to the size of the smallest recess in the substrate. Applicants respectfully argue that none of the cited references teach or suggest the above cited limitations. For at least these reasons, the Claims 1 and 13 are non-obvious over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection. The dependent claims rejected under this paragraph are also allowable for being based on allowable base claims, and allowance of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Second Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Roitman and Khan, Chen, or Watanabe as applied to claims 1-4 and 10-14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0077175 to Eisenbeiss et al. (hereinafter "Eisenbeiss"). This rejection is respectfully traversed. The dependent claims rejected under this paragraph are also allowable for being based on allowable base Claims 1 and 13 as discussed above, and allowance of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Third Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Roitman and Khan, Chen, or Watanabe as applied to claims 1-4 and 10-14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,176,962 to Soane et al. (hereinafter “Soane”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. The dependent claim rejected under this paragraph is also allowable for being based on allowable base Claim 1 as discussed above, and allowance of the dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Fourth Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Roitman and Khan, Chen, or Watanabe as applied to claims 1-4 and 10-14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,932,315 to Lum et al. (hereinafter “Lum”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. The dependent claims rejected under this paragraph are also allowable for being based on allowable base Claims 1 and 13 as discussed above, and allowance of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

It is believed that this reply places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this reply is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698. A three (3) month extension accompanies this Reply.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 7, 2009

/Suvashis Bhattacharya/
Suvashis Bhattacharya
Reg. No. 46,554

Nixon Peabody LLP
200 Page Mill Road
2nd Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94306
Tel. (650) 320-7700
Fax (650) 320-7701